Nuremberg: The Crime That Will Not Die

(Ernst Zündel)

On the eve of the 50th Anniversary of the Nuremberg Trials, it is appropriate that I share with my English-speaking readerships a few reflections pertaining to those trials. I'd like to start with a revealing and thought-provoking quote coming from none other than Nahum Goldman, long-time president of the World Jewish Congress, in a book entitled "The Jewish Paradox."

> ***"Apart from my encounter with the survivors of the concentration camps after the liberation, I only returned officially to Germany in order to meet Chancellor Adenauer and open negotiations about reparations. These reparations constitute an extraordinary innovation in terms of international law.***
>
> ***Until then, when a country lost a war, it paid damages to the victor, but it was a matter between states, between governments. Now for the first time a nation was to give reparations either to ordinary individuals or to Israel, which did not legally exist at the time of Hitler's crimes. All the same, I must admit that the idea did not come from me.***
>
> ***"During the war the WJC (World Jewish Congress) had created an Institute of Jewish Affairs in New York (its headquarters are now in London). The directors were two great Lithuanian Jewish jurists, Jacob and Nehemiah Robinson. Thanks to them, the Institute worked out two completely revolutionary ideas: the Nuremberg tribunal and German reparations." ("The Jewish Paradox," (Grosset & Dunlap, 1978, p 122)***

In the United States, the new specialty channel, "Court TV," is treating the whole of the North American continent to a special about Nuremberg--a television hate fest lasting about 15 hours in total length. Likewise, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Radio Division, recently aired a sequel using static-distorted, crackling old short wave newscasts from the proceedings in Nuremberg in 1946. Once again, newsreel commentators regurgitate ad nauseamall the disgusting and lying testimony of perjurers and con artists, along with the sad "testimony" frequently tortured out of Germany's military and political leaders.

I can only call these broadcasts "spreading of hate," which is a crime in Canada under its hate law against an identifiable ethnic group, namely the Germans--under the guise of showing "history." The current German vassal or Quisling state (my apologies to Mr. Quisling!) established by the Allies in post-war Germany--a state whose roots and foundations stem out of these disgusting proceedings of Allied vengeance against a vanquished German people--will not defend its own people against this avalanche of hate and lies, so I will try to do it. Be prepared for some food for thought.

It speaks to the tenor of our times that this may be the first time some of my readers may have been exposed to a different historical slant on the Nuremberg Trials. We are so habituated to slander and libel that often we don't even notice it or recognize it as such. We are so used to seeing Germany as the convenient and deserving whipping boy for all its "Nazi crimes" we hardly ever give a thought to its creation--or its Godfathers.

Nahum Goldman writes in The Jewish Paradox, page 123:

> ***During a meeting of the World Jewish Congress in London, a Russian Jew called Noah Baron, a wonderful man and great idealist . . . talked me into taking an active part by first of all meeting Adenauer. I was very hesitant at heart, because it was no easy matter for me to talk to the Germans again. And in fact it was eventually my head, and not my heart, which decided me to negotiate. But I laid down a precondition: before I would meet the Chancellor to open negotiations: Adenauer had to make a solemn statement to the Bundestag; he must say that although the Germany of those days was certainly not the Germany which had produced***

> ***Auschwitz . . . it nevertheless inherited the Nazis' responsibilities, and reparations were its duty; he must add that material reparations could not erase the evil done to the Jews by the Germans.*** **(emphasis added).**

Let's see now how it all began--and evolved!--this matter of the "Nuremberg Trials" resulting in such guilt and such enormous sums of reparations squeezed out of a defeated country, Germany over the last 50 years.

When we think of the Nuremberg trials, we think of Auschwitz, Bergen Belsen, Dachau--places that the Allies "liberated" and where they "found those skeletons"--which yielded those much-exploited and useful photographic backdrops to justify what was to follow ever since.

Guilt, expertly used, is a terrible weapon, a powerful tool and also a handsome cash cow. There was, in fact, a policy and program locked in place to punish Germany for alleged war time crimes which was planned and implemented long before the "crimes" of Nazi Germany were "revealed" via newsreels and sensationalized headlines to a stunned, shuddering, horrified world.

There are millions of words, and tens of thousands of books, which have been written about the Nuremberg proceedings in response to these alleged crimes--publications in all kinds of languages, all parroting the post-war Allied propaganda and borrowing its footnotes from each other. A lie repeated six million times, however, does not become the truth by mere repetition. This letter will inspect the pre-conditions and the reasons for the lie--one of which was that Nuremberg and those disgusting proceedings turned out to be the midwives of the Holocaust propaganda.

The generations who have grown into adulthood since the end of the Second World War have been allowed little chance to look at the Nuremberg trials critically. They have not been allowed access, for instance, to information showing what some important people and personalities at the time thought about the whole disgusting process of using ex post facto laws against a virtually defenseless, militarily defeated and militarily occupied former enemy.

According to Nahum Goldman, former president of the Jewish World Congress, even during the war plans were being mapped out with great care and cunning and the foundation for the lie was being laid. Long before America agreed to feed its young men into a fratricidal war fought not for American national interests but for the interests of an alien people and a State that did not even then exist, there came into being an Institute of Jewish Affairs in New York that cooked up a devilish brew.

Writes Goldman in The Jewish Paradox, pages 122-123, addressing this question:

> ***The Institute's . . . idea was that Nazi Germany ought to pay after its defeat. That still required belief in the defeat, at the time when it seemed likely that the war in Europe was lost for the Allies, but like Churchill and de Gaulle I kept my faith. I never doubted for a moment, because I knew that Hitler would never manage to moderate himself and that his excesses would draw the Allies into the conflict. According to the Institute's conclusions, the German reparations would first have to be paid to people who had lost their belongings through the Nazis. Further, if, as we hoped, the Jewish state was created, the Germans would pay compensation to enable the survivors to settle there. The first time this idea was expressed was during the war, in the course of a conference in Baltimore.***

As we all know and are never allowed to forget, in due time Hitler lost the war. Now it was time to conduct Stalinist type show trials against the defeated German leadership and then hand the world its villains. Was this about "punishment"? Think again!

Continues Goldman:

> ***The importance of the tribunal which sat at Nuremberg has not been reckoned at its true worth. According to international law it was in fact impossible to punish soldiers who had been obeying orders. It was Jacob Robinson who had this extravagant, sensational idea. When he began to canvass it among the jurists of the American Supreme Court, they took him for a fool. "What did these Nazi officers do that was so unprecedented?" they asked. "You can imagine Hitler standing trial, or maybe even Goering, but these are simple soldiers who carried out their orders and behaved as loyal soldiers." We therefore had the utmost trouble in per suading the Allies; the British were fairly opposed, the French barely interested, and although they took part later they did not play any great part. The success came from Robinson managing to convince the Supreme Court judge, Robert Jackson. (The Jewish Paradox, p 122)***

What followed next? Total communications control and news manipulation through censorship.

After the war was over and Germany had lost, the Allied powers, in effect, by virtue of having established a military government--one might as well call it a military dictatorship, in many ways more restrictive than Adolf Hitler's state had been--had a tight grip on all channels of communications. This fact cannot be overstated.

From control and supervision of the mail service to the telegraph and telephone systems to radio stations to book, newspaper and magazine publishing houses, the Allies were fully in charge through a clever "licensing system." Anyone who did not toe the Allied propaganda line lost their license or had their license suspended as punishment. Journalists lost their accreditations. Newspapers lost their already very scarce paper or printer's ink allocations or reduced-rate postal shipping privileges. Additionally, Germany was divided into military occupation zones, which were like mini-states, issuing their own passports, food and fuel as well as clothing and stationary ration cards and coupons. If you wanted to travel in occupied Germany from one zone to another in the immediate postwar years, you had to explain to the local military authorities in a written request why you wanted to travel to another zone, whom you wanted to see, and where you intended to stay. You had to request ration coupons for the period of your absence. There were other bureaucratic, for the Nuremberg defense team extremely inconvenient restrictions as well--some by design, some by default. Many trains didn't run on schedule or not at all for lack of coal. Most buildings were unheated. The populace starved. The country was largely without men. There were ruins wherever you looked. There was misery everywhere--more misery than there had ever been during the bitterly fought war.

I find in my conversations and interviews and even during my court cases that judges, prosecutors and even defense lawyers have not the foggiest idea what life was really like for the defense teams in Nuremberg in 1946-1949. Today's generation, brainwashed by the high-tech razzle-dazzle of the O.J. Simpson media-feeding frenzy and image glut-out, has not a clue under what circumstances the German defense lawyers worked. Not a clue! Furthermore, I suspect that the cynical generation of money-grabbing, self-promoting attorneys, prosecutors and judges of today don't give a damn about what was the horrible truth and the reality then. Nonetheless, some of these things must be recorded for history's sake.

Imagine if you told the occupation powers you wanted to go to Nuremberg to testify in defense of Rudolf Hess, Joachim von Ribbentrop, Kaltenbrunner, Göring, Streicher or military leaders like Keitel, Jodl, Dönitz, Raeder or others! If the military man to whom you applied for permission was a Jew in the uniform of Russia, France, America or England, imagine the response! Would he not think the German applicant was still a "Nazi lover" intent on additional "mischief"? It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out how many people would shy away from getting politically involved as defense witnesses or experts after having just survived a brutal war, horrendous bombing raids and the raping and plundering hordes of the self-appointed "liberators." Who would choose voluntarily to expose himself to arrest, beatings, torture etc., considering the circumstances?

It is remarkable that there were defense witnesses at all who came forward and tried to help those hapless prisoners in Nuremberg. There are instances of the defense lawyers having located and convinced crucial defense witnesses to testify who were being held as prisoners in Allied prison camps, only to find them--convenient for the prosecution!-- getting "lost" in transfers, "lost" long enough until the proceedings had passed the point where their testimony could have been of use to the defense.

These defense lawyers themselves worked against almost insurmountable odds. They sat in cold, wet, bombed-out basements of half-ruined houses with boarded-up windows, working in overcoats, writing with stiffened fingers, wearing hats, scarves and gloves to guard themselves against the cold and creeping dampness, trying to write some text and formulate some argument so that a client, who was daily vilified in the press and on radio, in the news reels and on Armed Forces radio as a despicable monster and a criminal with no human traits, might get a semblance of a defense in those nightmarish, Kafkaesque proceedings called the Nuremberg Trials.

Those were truly desperate times for the Germans! The defense was hampered by lack of staff, space, typewriters and ribbons and even carbon paper--yes, carbon paper!--as well as photocopying facilities and paper supplies. Remember that, in 1945, a photocopy meant exactly what it said. A photograph had to be taken using special line-film. A negative had to be developed and dried. This, in turn, had to be projected by means of an enlarger onto light-sensitive photographic paper in a dark room, which had then to be developed using chemicals not easily available and electric drum dryers using up precious electricity to dry the prints. (Electricity was rationed severely to approximately two hours every day, with only so many kilowatt allowed per person.)

Try to put yourself in the defense lawyers' or in this case, the whole German defense teams' place, when two dozen lawyers, defending a great number of different clients, are handed a 30, 50, 100 or 200 page document by the prosecuion--often this was the only set of a document for all the lawyers!--and you had a limited time till court day to study, analyze, weigh the charges, look for potentially exonerating witnesses in a bombed-out country where tens of millions were homeless, freezing and starving. The old, still existing phone books and city directories were virtually useless, because telephone service was not yet restored in many places and private people hardly ever got a phone approved by the occupation authorities unless you were "essential"--let's say, like a medical doctor.

Now let's look at the defendants' rights to get the lawyer of their choice--a sacred right in most civilized countries. What do you think that meant in those hysterical, lawless days in post-war Germany? Which lawyer could afford to side with a "Nazi monster"? Many years later, my own lawyer has been accused during my own trials in peaceful, democratic Canada for ". . . being too closely associated" with me, the accused, by media commentators, even lawyers and even, occasionally, a judge who showed the intolerance rampant against a vilified accused like me by those in contemporary society who have the fate of accused people in their hands. Imagine what courage it must have taken for those Nuremberg defense lawyers--who also were fathers of children, who were husbands to wives--all glad to have survived the war, all of them trying to build new careers out of the rubble of defeated, devastated and decimated Germany in 1946.

It took much more than guts. It took real dedication to a principle and a love of justice few in today's society could claim to have or hold.

Let's say you were a lawyer of such heroic proportions. The Allies, more often than not, could declare you a "Nazi" as well, putting you in the class of "criminals," since the Nazi party was declared a "criminal organization" by the conquerors. Most of the mental elite of Germany had been members of the National Socialist Party, and almost all had gone to war and, chances were, had been killed or severely wounded. Those who survived, were really persona non grata. They came back from a devastating war and found themselves not only criminalized but deprived of their civic and human rights by cruel conquerors who all the while kept on prattling incessantly in their propaganda about the wonderful Allied New Order.

If, against tremendous odds, you finally found yourself screened, interrogated, and accredited as a lawyer at the Nuremberg trials--what did you face, in fact? Let's take a cold, hard look at this so-called International Military Tribunal. How righteous and noble that sounds! A label like that can hide many a sore. The Nuremberg sore is still running.

Here is what Nuremberg was:

It was not an international military tribunal at all. It was not even international in composition. The victors

instead sat in judgment over the vanquished. Justice Harlan Fiske Stone, who was then the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court and Justice Jackson's (the Chief American Prosecutor at Nuremberg) boss in that role, had this to say while speaking to a reporter for Fortune Magazine, as quoted in: Harlan Fiske Stone: Pillar of the Law, Alpheus Thomas Mason, The Viking Press, page 715:

> ***"For your information, but not for publication as coming from me, I would like to advise you that the Supreme Court had nothing to do, either directly or indirectly, with the Nuremberg Trials, or the governmental action which authorized them. I was not advised of Justice Jackson's participation until his appointment by the Executive was announced in the newspapers.***
>
> ***"So far as the Nuremberg trial is an attempt to justify the application of the power of the victor to the vanquished because the vanquished made aggressive war," (Stone) explained, "I dislike extremely to see it dressed up with a false facade of legality. The best that can be said for it is that it is a political act of the victorious States, which may be morally right, as was the sequestration of Napoleon about 1815. But the allies in that day did not feel it necessary to justify it by an appeal to nonexistent legal principles. As a practical matter, it seems to me that the difficulties and uncertainties of saying who is the aggressor under the conditions which produce modern war should make us hesitate to lay down for the future a principle which would always require that question to be answered by the victor.***
>
> ***"All wars are in fact aggressive. The real source of authority is `the powers of the victors over the vanquished.'***
>
> ***"It would not disturb me greatly," he wrote, "if that power were openly and frankly used to punish the German leaders for being a bad lot, but it disturbs me some to have it dressed up in the habiliments of the Common Law and the constitutional safeguards to those charged with crime. It looks as though we were committing ourselves to the proposition that the outcome of every war must be that the leaders of the vanquished must be executed by the victors." (*emphasis added)**

That was the reality. Judge Jackson, handling the prosecution of Nuremberg's most important trials was a man with presidential ambitions who needed a high profile carved out of a self-serving stage: The Nuremberg Trials were to be the launching pad of his presidential race. The Nuremberg court was not selected from, or composed of, judges of the neutral Swiss, or the neutral Swedes, or some more distant African, Asian or Latin American countries. American civilian judges to a large extent made up the core of the Allied judges--not military career officers, who might have had some understanding and compassion for what the military leaders and the civilian government under extreme war time conditions lived through. They could have undoubtedly had a greater appreciation of why some of the wartime measures were undertaken by Germany in the desperate days of the war. The "liberal country club" experienced set of small town American judges could not.

Furthermore, the Allied victors blatantly carried on their war against the Germans by other means long after the shooting had stopped--not by bombs and bullets but this time by falsely diagnosing psychologists or, worse, by giving torturers a free hand: cynical and brutal investigators who could, and frequently did, mistreat, beat, whip, starve, suffocate and mutilate their prisoners into giving confessions and statements which were as cruelly extracted as were the confessions from witches during the disgusting witchcraft trials of the Dark Ages.

The injustice of the Nuremberg Trials was testified to not only by Harlan Fiske Stone, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, but also Iowa Supreme Court Justice Charles F. Wennerstrum, a man of the Midwest, who sat on one of the tribunals trying lesser alleged Nazi war criminals after the war.

Wennerstrum pointed out in a celebrated and controversial interview given to a reporter of the Chicago Daily Tribune that frequently the interrogators and some of the prosecutors were Jews who had fled Nazi Germany and came back in Allied uniforms to torment and seek revenge on the National Socialists who had wanted to expel the Jews from European living space because they considered them harmful to the war effort and to Western

European civilization.

Here is how the article described the lot that came to post-war Germany to settle private scores, as seen through Justice Wennerstrum's eyes, after he quit in disgust:

> ***"If I had known seven months ago what I know today," (Wennerstrum) told friends as he packed to leave for America, "I would never have come here. . . The initial war crimes trial here was judged and prosecuted by Americans, Russians, British and French with much of the time, effort and expenses devoted to whitewashing the Allies and placing the sole blame for World War II upon Germany.***
>
> ***"What I have said of the nationalist character of the tribunals," the judge continued, "applies to the prosecution. The high ideals announced as the motives for creating these tribunals has not been evident.***
>
> ***"The prosecution has failed to maintain objectivity aloof from vindictiveness, aloof from personal ambitions for convictions. It has failed to strive to lay down precedents which might help the world to avoid future wars.***
>
> ***The entire atmosphere here is unwholesome. Linguists were needed. the Americans are notably poor linguists. Lawyers, clerks, interpreters and researchers were employed who became Americans only in recent years, whose backgrounds were embedded in Europe's hatreds and prejudices. . .*** **(emphasis added) (Chicago Daily Tribune, 23 February 1948)**

In other words, the Allies supplied the interrogators, most of them Jews--as some of the victims, who had had a lifetime of experience in dealing with Jews and thus recognized them, have stated. Those of us who are German and can speak German can easily discern the ethnicity of some of the accusers by their mere accents and patterns of speech, even in radio broadcasts and newsreels.

Most of the evidence in the trials was "documentary," selected by the Allies from the large tonnage of captured records. The document selection was made by the prosecution. The defense had access only to those documents which the prosecution considered material to the case and were made available to the defense. The Allies could choose to release or to hide and/or destroy any documents which did not fit their post-war strategy or plans at Nuremberg. The Allies admitted elsewhere that their propaganda Ministries and Intelligence Services had previously forged Nazi stamps, Nazi passes, Nazi passports, orders, ID cards etc. which fooled the Nazis many times because they were so perfect and over which the Allied propagandists gloat to this day. It does not take a great leap of the imagination to think what these same Allied Government agencies, their personnel and forgers of documents could do now with all the captured genuine German document-producing facilities, the captured type writers, rubber stamps and tons of letter heads of all sizes and description and of any National Socialist organization you care to mention.

Even setting aside questionable "documentary" evidence, let's look at some of the accused's "testimony"--how it was extracted, and what it really means.

Like vile exclamation marks, at the heart of the Nuremberg Tribunal stand certain words: "Genocide" "Gas chamber." "Six million." These words, and the value judgment concepts they connote, were derived largely from the admissions and affidavit of one man, Rudolf Hoess, the one-time war-time Kommandant at Auschwitz.

Rudolf Hoess was the Allies' most important witness to the "Holocaust." His affidavit and his testimony were quoted extensively both by the prosecution and in the judgment of the IMT at Nuremberg, as well as by the press. It was his testimony which laid the foundation and validated the claim of the ". . . extermination of millions of people by gas at Auschwitz." Hoess's "confession" is heavily relied upon by historians like Raul Hilberg and others as a primary documentary source to this day.

It is true that Hoess witnessed at Nuremberg to horrendous "atrocities," and he also confirmed the "truth" under oath of an affidavit which he agreed to sign for the prosecution. In it, he confessed to having given orders for the gassing of millions of victims. The affidavit, by the way, was in English, a language he did not speak or understand, according to family members.

We now know from the book "Legions of Death" that Rudolf Hoess was beaten almost to death by Jewish members of the British Field Police Force upon capture and badly mistreated thereafter until he gave this very devastating "testimony" and "affidavit" used by the Allies propagandists ever since. You be the judge. Here is an excerpt from this book by Rupert Butler, published by Hamlyn Paperbacks, page 235:

> ***At 5 PM on 11 March 1946, Frau Hoess opened her front door to six intelligence specialists in British uniform, most of them tall and menacing and all of them practiced in the more sophisticated techniques of sustained and merciless investigation.***
>
> ***No physical violence was used on the family: it was scarcely necessary. Wife and children were separated and guarded. Clarke's tone was deliberately low-key and conversational.***
>
> ***He began mildly: "I understand your husband came to see you as recently as last night."***
>
> ***Frau Hoess merely replied: "I haven't seen him since he absconded months ago"***
>
> ***Clarke tried once more, saying gently but with a tone of reproach: "You know that isn't true." Then all at once his manner had changed and he was shouting: "If you don't tell us, we'll turn you over to the Russians and they'll put you before a firing squad. Your son will go to Siberia."***
>
> ***It proved more than enough. Eventually, a broken Frau Hoess betrayed the whereabouts of the former Auschwitz Kommandant, the man who now called himself Franz Lang. Suitable intimidation of the son and daughter produced precisely identical information.***
>
> ***When they found Hoess, here is how the capture played out. Clarke, one of the participants, recalls it vividly:***
>
> ***"He was lying on top of a three-tier bunker wearing a new pair of silk pyjamas. We discovered later that he had lost the cyanide pill most of them carried. Not that he would have had much chance to use it because we had rammed a torch (flashlight) into his mouth."***
>
> ***Hoess screamed in terror at the mere sight of the British uniforms.***
>
> ***Clarke yelled: "What is your name?"***
>
> ***With each answer of "Franz Lang," Clarke's hand crashed into the face of the prisoner. The fourth time that happened, Hoess broke and admitted who he was.***
>
> ***The admission suddenly unleashed the loathing of the Jewish sergeants in the arresting party whose parents had died in Auschwitz following an order signed by Hoess.***
>
> ***The prisoner was torn from the top bunk, the pyjama ripped from his body. He was then dragged naked to one of the slaughter tables, where it seemed to Clarke the blows and screams were endless.***
>
> ***Eventually, the Medical Officer urged the Captain: "Call them off, unless you want to take back a corpse."***
>
> ***A blanket was thrown over Hoess and he was dragged to Clarke's car, where the sergeant poured***

a substantial slug of whiskey down his throat. Then Hoess tried to sleep.

Clarke thrust his service stick under the man's eyelids and ordered in German: "Keep your pig eyes open, you swine." . . .

The party arrived back at Heide around three in the morning. The snow was swirling still, but the blanket was torn from Hoess and he was made to walk completely nude through the prison yard to his cell. It took three days to get a coherent statement out of him.

This statement, tortured and terrorized out of him, was the one we are all familiar with--the "proof" for the so-called "gassing of the Jews."

Historians today are finally admitting that Hoess is a totally unreliable witness--and is it any wonder? He spoke of a concentration camp "Wolzek" which does not even exist. He swore that 2,500,000 people were gassed and burned at Auschwitz and a further half million died of disease, for a total dead of three million. The Toronto Sun of July 18, 1990 claimed 1.5 million. The Washington Post, on the same date, also mentioned 1.5 million. Quoted from an article by Krzyszlov Leski, we have the following:

Poland has cut its estimate of the number of people killed by the Nazis in the Auschwitz death camp from 4 million to just over 1 million.

The vast majority of the dead are now accepted to have been Jews, despite claims by the former Polish communist government that as many Poles perished in Hitler's largest concentration camp. . .

The new study could rekindle the controversy over the scale of Hitler's final solution."

Shevach Weiss, a death camp survivor and Labor Party member of the Israeli Parliament, expressed disbelief at the revised estimates, saying: "It sounds shocking and strange." . . .

Shmuel Krakowsky, head of research at Israel's Yad Vashem memorial for Jewish victims of the Holocaust, said the new Polish figures were correct.

"The 4 million figure was let slip by Capt. Rudolf Hoess, the death camp's Nazi commander. Some have bought it, but it was exaggerated." . . .

But the Polish authorities said accurate estimates of the number killed could only be made by studying German documents seized by the Soviet Union. But Moscow has refused to return the archives.

A most convenient excuse! In 1989 I organized a write-in campaign to persuade the then-Soviet Leader Gorbachev to release the Auschwitz Death Registers captured in 1945 when the Red Army took over the Auschwitz complex. A few months afterwards this actually happened. Gorbachev released these all-important documents to the Red Cross, which showed in minute detail why people had died in Auschwitz, the cause and time of death, their birth, address etc.

74,000 names of people who had died were listed, of which only approximately 30,000 were Jews, along with an almost equal number of Poles and members of other nationalities.

The incredibly shrinking Holocaust! The "millions" that we have heard about for half a century and that we hear and read about still today all started with the "testimony" beaten out of poor Hoess on that horrible night in defeated Germany.

Historian Christopher Browning finally had to admit in a recent Vanity Fair article that Hoess was an unreliable witness. Browning stated that

> ***". . . Hoess was always a very weak and confused witness. The revisionists use him all the time for this reason, in order to try and discredit the memory of Auschwitz as a whole."*** **(Holocaust Revisionism Source Book, 1994, p. 1)**

But does that invalidate the Revisionist claims or their strategy? Not at all. On the contrary. After all, Hoess's testimony was used as the skeleton on which the entire Holocaust myth about mass gassings was constructed in the first place. Revisionists have concentrated on Hoess precisely because he is probably the most important source for Holocaust historians' conclusions on and exaggerations about the Holocaust. Raul Hilberg, who wrote the "Bible" of the "Holocaust," The Destruction of the European Jews, (Holmes & Meier, Revised Edition, 1985) relies on Hoess's testimony heavily, and Hoess was the primary witness relied upon by the Nuremberg Tribunal in their judgment regarding the "extermination of the Jews," even though he told the court of having been savagely tortured.

What's more, Hoess's treatment by the Allies and the total unreliability of his "evidence" are not unusual. We don't know how many of the accused at the Nuremberg trials were badly mistreated, since references in the trial transcripts to their mistreatment was expunged from the record. (Read this again! Material damaging to the Allies was expunged from the Nuremberg trial transcripts!)

An example is Streicher's testimony. Streicher was reported in the London Times as having testified that he was tortured, whipped, spat on, and forced to drink from a latrine. (Streicher Opens His Case, The Times, April 27, 1946). His testimony was later expunged from the record of the trial with the active participation of the prosecution, the president of the Tribunal, and even his own defense lawyer!

Other traces of the brutal treatment of the Nuremberg prisoners, however, have survived. One of these witnesses was Gauleiter Sauckel's reference to threats to his family, which did remain in the transcript. During his testimony in May of 1946, Sauckel testified that he signed a document, even though he did not know what was in that document, after his family of 10 children was threatened with deportation to Russia.

And finally, it must not be forgotten that t his is the only judicial proceeding conducted in the name of civilized nations where there was no appeal mechanism to a parallel or higher authority for a review of the proceedings or any verdicts that this so-called international military tribunal arrived at. Their judgments over the leadership of Europe's most populous state, against whom they had just fought a murderous, near genocidal war, were final and deadly.

Keep all that in mind as you read, watch and listen to all the emotional hype in the mass media on television and radio of these days. And for what?

The Jewish leader Nahum Goldman spells it out for you in his astounding book, The Jewish Paradox, Pages 123-125, admitting to the mother of all frauds. In his own words, at the conclusion of the agreement Goldman obtained from Dr. Adenauer, the German Quisling State's first Allied-appointed chancellor,

> ***". . . the Germans will have paid out a total of 80 billion. . . Without the German reparations that started coming through during its first ten years as a state, Israel would not have half of its present infrastructure: All the trains in Israel are German, the ships are German, and the same goes for electrical installations and a great deal of Israel's industry . . . and that is setting aside the individual pensions paid to survivors. Israel today receives hundreds of millions of dollars in German currency each year . . . In some years the sums of money received by Israel from Germany has been as much as double or treble the contribution made by collections from international Jewry. Nowadays, there is no longer any opposition to the principle.*** **(emphasis added)**

Not anywhere you look!

After the Nuremberg Trials and Proceedings are stripped of the hyperbole and smoke screens which surrounds them, it can be put quite bluntly:

The Allies did it all. The Allies fought a war on foreign shores--in part to establish the State of Israel. The Allies lent a willing hand to political ambitions that grew out of the Zionist camp. By means of the Nuremberg trials, the Allies helped the establishment and financing of Israel. So as to secure Israel, the Allies and their personnel became accusers, researchers, interrogators, prosecutors, judges and executioners--all in one! The Allies supplied the "experts" who sifted through the German documents, which were all totally in Allied control, highlighting incriminating documents, discarding exonerating evidence. These investigators were told only to "find" incriminating documents against the hapless accused, as I was told by the American scholar Charles Weber, Ph.D., who had been one of these Allied researchers, and who testified at my own trials. These researchers were told were told to ignore the documents that might have spared the lives of the accused German leaders. When all was said and done, there was not even an appeal.

U.S. Chief Justice Harlan Fiske Stone, speaking of the American Chief Prosecutor, Jackson, finally had this to say, as mentioned in the Viking Press hard cover, cited before, p. 746 :

> ***"Jackson is away conducting his high grade lynching party in Nuremberg," he remarked. "I don't mind what he does to the Nazis, but I hate to see the pretense that he is running a court and proceeding according to common law.***
>
> ***This is a little too sanctimonious a fraud to meet my old-fashioned ideas."***

Some sanctimonious fraud!

Some record for the Allies to be "proud of"--to have helped manufacture such a sick, perverted Marxist/Zionist inspired legal farce that would condemn to death the leaders of the only military effort ever undertaken to stop the "evil empire" from bringing to us all their "hate law" ideology.

Are now the chickens coming home to roost? That's how America and the "free world" have showed their gratitude to the defenders of Europe and Western Civilization: by hanging brave and honest men who tried so valiantly for so long to stop the decadence and the hypocrisy of what we now call, shuddering, ". . . the coming New World Order"!

I bow my head in reverence to those who were judicially murdered at Nuremberg. They were the world's martyrs, not villains. Not one of them would have been condemned to death in a fair trial. Not one! Let's not forget they sacrificed an entire nation, and in the end themselves, to save Western civilization. They were defeated by thugs in robes and gangsters in uniform and by the conspiracies hatched by shysters from the ghettos and shtetls of Eastern Europe.